

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on March 21, 2007 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner rejected claims 18-30. Claims 1-17 were previously cancelled. Claims 18 and 25 are the independent claims. Claim 25 has been amended to more clearly define the inventive subject matter. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2007 and also render all currently pending claims at issue patentably distinct over the references of record.

### I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 18-30 are rejected under 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,970,683 to Harshaw et al. ("Harshaw") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,691,006 to Sinex ("Sinex").

Claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, displaying a first layout comprising a checklist, the checklist displayed on a first section of the display and including a plurality of tasks and displaying a second layout without user input comprising the checklist and aircraft data related to a first task, if a determination is made to display the aircraft data related to the first task, the checklist displayed on the first section of the display and the aircraft data related to the first task displayed on a second section of the display.

Claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, displaying a second layout comprising an available checklist, upon receipt of a first user input, the available checklist displayed on a first section of the display and displaying a third layout without user input comprising the available checklist and aircraft data, if a determination is made to display the aircraft data related to a first task, the available checklist displayed on the first section of the display and the aircraft data related to the first task displayed on a second section of the display.

Harshaw discloses a computerized checklist system for ensuring safe and consistent operation of sophisticated equipment. See Abstract. Sinex relates to a system for assigning maintenance tasks to crew members of a maintenance crew during a dynamically-planned maintenance check for an aircraft. See Abstract. However, neither, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests each and every element recited in claims 18 and 25.

Specifically, neither reference discloses or teaches displaying a first layout comprising a checklist, **the checklist displayed on a first section** of the display and displaying a second layout where **the checklist displayed on the first section** of the display and **the aircraft data related to the first task displayed on a second section** of the display, as recited in claim 18. Additionally, nowhere is there disclosure of displaying a second layout comprising an available checklist, **the available checklist displayed on a first section** of the display and displaying a third layout, and displaying a third layout comprising the available checklist and aircraft data, **the available checklist displayed on the first section** of the display and **the aircraft data related to the first task displayed on a second section** of the display, as recited in claim 25.

Moreover, there is no teaching of displaying a layout including **the checklist and the aircraft data**, as recited in claims 18 and 25. At best, Sinex shows a task 342 with a pictures of an aircraft 376, however, nowhere is there disclosure of the checklist with data related to the aircraft.

Examiner is well aware of the three basic criteria necessary to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and third, the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants' disclosure. In Re Vaack, 947 Fed. 2d 488, 20 USPQ 2d, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Here, neither Harshaw nor Sinex, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 18 and 25. Accordingly, as Harshaw and Sinex fail to teach each and every element of independent claims 18 and 25, and hence, dependent claims 19-24 and 26-30, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

### III. CONCLUSION

Based on the above, independent Claims 18 and 25 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

None of the other art of record is understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicants have not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated April 23, 2007

/CINDY H. KWACALA/  
Cindy H. Kwacala  
Registration No. 47,667  
(480) 385-5060

**Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, P.C.**  
Customer No. 29906